DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 185 JC 030 390

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers. A Revision of the Commission's 1990 "Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers." Commission Report. |
| INSTITUTION | California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento. |
| REPORT NO | CPEC-R-92-18 |
| PUB DATE | 1992-08-00 |
| NOTE | 34p.; Contains small print. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | For full text: http://www.cpec.ca.gov/CompleteReports/1992Reports/92-18.pdf. |
| PUB TYPE | Guides - Non-Classroom (055) |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Campus Planning; *Campuses; Community Colleges; Economic Impact; Economics of Education; Educational Complexes ; *Educational Policy; Planning; Public Policy; State Legislation; *Strategic Planning; Two Year Colleges |
| IDENTIFIERS | *California |

ABSTRACT

The California Postsecondary Commission must approve sites for new institutions or branches of public postsecondary educational institutions in the state of California. After a brief summary, this document presents revisions to the Commission's 1990 Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers. The 1990 guidelines called for a three-stage review concept: (1) statewide plan; (2) preliminary review; and (3) final review. The revised guidelines call for clarification of some requirements and procedures, including the following: (1) requirements for the statewide plan and letter of intent warrant greater clarification, particularly regarding the need for inter-system cooperation; (2) the 1990 guidelines assumed that a single set of procedures could be applied to all three public systems, while in practice there are major functional differences between the systems; and (3) over the years, the distinctions among terms such as college, center, and institution have become unclear and must be defined. This document offers detailed revisions to the guidelines that include (1) the systemwide long-range plan; (2) the letter of intent to expand; (3) the Commission's response to the letter of intent; (4) development of the needs study; and (5) commission action. The new guidelines also offer 10 criteria for evaluating proposals, including need, location, funding, and serving the disadvantaged. Appended are: (1) Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers (1990 Edition); and (2) Guide for Community College Districts Projection of Enrollment and Annual Average Weekly Contact Hours for New Colleges and Educational Centers. (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 479 185

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. RATLIFF

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

It is the intent of the Legislatur that sites for new institutions or branches of th University of California and the California State University and the classes of off-campus centers as the Commission shall determine, shall not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by Commission.

# GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AND EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

AUGUST 1992 COMMISSION REPORT 92 18

TC030390

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Summary

Among the statutory responsibilities of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is the review of proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers of the State's public higher education institutions Due to the most severe budget crisis in the history of California's State government and the continuing demand for postsecondary education services, the need for careful review of these proposals has never been more apparent

To that end, the Commission has revised its guidelines for reviewing these proposals in order to to streamline and clarify the review and approval process Although the Commission revised these guidelines most recently in 1990, growing demand for approval review by the community colleges combined with severe staff reductions at both the Commission and the Department of Finance have made this 1992 revision necessary

The Commission adopted these new guidelines at its meeting of August 24, 1992, on recommendation of its Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee, as part of its adoption of *A Framework for Statewide Facilities Planning* (Commission Report 92-17), In that document, the Commission announced creation of a permanent Capital Outlay Planning Advisory Committee that will involve all four of California's systems of higher education and various State regulatory and control agencies in a collaborative effort designed to use scarce resources in the most effective manner Also in that document, the Commission asked each system of higher education to submit to it a 15-year long-range plan every five years beginning in 1994, so that the Commission may submit a total State 15-year plan to the Governor and Legislature every five years beginning in 1995

Additional copies of these guidelines may be obtained by writing the Commission at 1303 J Street, Fifth Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-2938

# GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AND EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

*A Revision of the Commission's 1990 "Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers"*

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1303 J Street • Fifth Floor • Sacramento, California 95814-2938

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

2B

**COMMISSION REPORT 92-18**
**PUBLISHED AUGUST 1992**

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 92-18 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Contents


Introduction 1

Policy Assumptions Used in Developing These Guidelines 2

Definitions 2

Projects Subject to Commission Review 3

Stages in the Review Process 3

1. The Systemwide Long-Range Plan 3
2. The "Letter of Intent to Expand" 4
3. Commission Response to the "Letter of Intent to Expand" 7
4. Development of the "Needs Study" 7
5. Commission Action 7

Criteria for Evaluating Proposals 8

Criteria Related to Need 8

1. Enrollment Projections 8
2. Programmatic Alternatives 9
3. Serving the Disadvantaged 9
4. Academic Planning and Program Justification 9
5. Consideration of Needed Funding 9

Criteria Related to Location 9

6. Consideration of Alternative Sites 9
7. Geographic and Physical Accessibility 10
8. Environmental and Social Impact 10
9. Effects on Other Institutions 10

Other Considerations 10

10. Economic Efficiency 10

**Appendix A:** Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers (1990 Edition) 11

**Appendix B:** Guide for Community College Districts Projection of Enrollment and Annual Average Weekly Contact Hours for New Colleges and Educational Centers 17

**References** 35

# Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers

## Introduction

*Commission responsibilities and authority regarding new campuses and centers*

Section 66904 of the California Education Code expresses the intent of the Legislature that the sites for new institutions or branches of public postsecondary education will not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission:

> It is the intent of the Legislature that sites for new institutions or branches of the University of California and the California State University, and the classes of off-campus centers as the Commission shall determine, shall not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission.
>
> It is further the intent of the Legislature that California community colleges shall not receive State funds for acquisition of sites or construction of new institutions, branches or off-campus centers unless recommended by the Commission Acquisition or construction of non-State-funded community colleges, branches and off-campus centers, and proposals for acquisition or construction shall be reported to and may be reviewed and commented upon by the Commission

*Evolution and purpose of the guidelines*

In order to carry out its given responsibilities in this area, the Commission adopted policies relating to the review of new campuses and centers in April 1975 and revised those policies in September 1978 and September 1982. Both the 1975 document and the two revisions outlined the Commission's basic assumptions under which the guidelines and procedures were developed and then specified the proposals subject to Commission review, the criteria for reviewing proposals, the schedule to be followed by the segments when submitting proposals, and the contents of the required "needs studies "

In 1990, the Commission approved a substantive revision of what by then was called *Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers* (reproduced in Appendix A on pages 11-15) Through that revision, the Commission sought to incorporate a statewide planning agenda into the quasi-regulatory function the guidelines have always represented, and the result was a greater systemwide attention to statewide perspectives than had previously been in evidence These new guidelines called for a statewide plan from each of the systems, then a "Letter of Intent" that identified a system's plans to create one or more new institutions, and finally, a formal needs study for the proposed new institution that would provide certain prescribed data elements and satisfy specific criteria At each stage of this process, the Commission would be able to comment either positively or negatively, thereby ensuring that planning for a new campus or center would not proceed to a point where it could not be reversed should the evidence indicate the necessity for a reversal

This three-stage review concept -- statewide plan, preliminary review, then final review -- appears to be fundamentally sound, but some clarifications of the 1990 document have nevertheless become essential, for several reasons

- In those *Guidelines*, the Commission stated only briefly its requirements for a statewide plan and for letters of intent These requirements warrant greater clarification, particularly regarding the need fo. inter-system cooperation, to assist the systems and community college districts in the development of proposals
- The 1990 *Guidelines* assumed that a single set of procedures could be applied to all three public systems In practice, this assumption was overly optimistic, and this 1992 revision more specifi-

cally recognizes the major functional differences among the three systems

- The procedures for developing enrollment projections need to be altered to account for the curtailment of activities created by the severe staffing reductions at the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance, which have eliminated its ability to make special projections for community college districts and reduced its capacity to project graduate enrollments
- The unprecedented number of proposals emanating from the community colleges, as well as the staff reductions experienced by the Commission, require a streamlining of the approval process Consequently, certain timelines have been shortened, and all have been clarified as to the duration of review at each stage of the process
- Over the years, the distinctions among several terms, such as "college," "center," and "institution," have become unclear

By 1992, experience with the 1990 procedures suggested that they needed revision in order to overcome these problemas and accommodate the changed planning environment in California, particularly related to California's diminished financial resources and growing college-age population

## Policy assumptions used in developing these guidelines

The following six policy assumptions are central to the development of the procedures and criteria that the Commission uses in reviewing proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers

1 It is State policy that each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education will have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education The California Community Colleges shall continue to be accessible to all persons at least 18 years of age who can benefit from the instruction offered, regardless of district boundaries The California State University and the University of California shall continue to be accessible to first-time freshmen among the pool of students eligible according to Master Plan eligibility guidelines Master Plan guidelines on undergraduate admission priorities will continue to be (1) continuing undergraduates in good standing, (2) California residents who are successful transfers from California public community colleges, (3) California residents entering at the freshman or sophomore level, and (4) residents of other states or foreign countries

2. The differentiation of function among the systems with regard to institutional mission shall continue to be as defined by the State's Master Plan for Higher Education

3 The University of California plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide need

4 The California State University plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide needs and special regional considerations.

5. The California Community Colleges plan and develop their campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of local needs

6 Planned enrollment capacities are established for and observed by all campuses of public postsecondary education These capacities are determined on the basis of statewide and institutional economies, community and campus environment, physical limitations on campus size, program requirements and student enrollment levels, and internal organization Planned enrollment capacities are established by the governing boards of community college districts (and reviewed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges) the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of California

## Definitions

For the purposes of these guidelines, the following definitions shall apply

*Outreach Operation* (all systems)· An outreach operation is an enterprise, operated away from a community college or university campus, in leased or donated facilities, which offers credit courses supported by State funds, and which serves a student

population of less than 500 full-time-equivalent students (FTES) at a single location

*Educational Center* (California Community Colleges). An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the parent district and administered by a parent college The center must enroll a minimum of 500 full-time-equivalent students, maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a president, chancellor, or superintendent), and offer programs leading to certificates or degrees to be conferred by the parent institution

*Educational Center* (The California State University) An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Trustees and administered by a parent State University campus. The center must offer courses and programs only at the upper division and graduate levels, enroll a minimum of 500 full-time-equivalent students, maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a president), and offer certificates or degrees to be conferred by the parent institution Educational facilities operated in other states and the District of Columbia shall not be regarded as educational centers for the purposes of these guidelines, unless State capital outlay funding is used for construction, renovation, or equipment.

*Educational Center* (University of California) An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Regents and administered by a parent University campus The center must offer courses and programs only at the upper division and graduate levels, enroll a minimum of 500 full-time equivalent students, maintain an on-site administration (typically headed by a dean or director, but not by a chancellor), and offer certificates or degrees to be conferred by the parent institution Organized Research Units (ORUs) and the Northern and Southern Regional Library Facilities shall not be regarded as educational centers. Educational facilities operated in other states and the District of Columbia shall not be regarded as educational centers unless State capital outlay funding is used for construction, renovation, or equipment.

*College* (California Community Colleges) A full-service, separately accredited, degree and certificate granting institution offering a full complement of lower-division programs and services, usually at a single campus location owned by the district; colleges enroll a minimum of 1,000 full-time-equivalent students. A college will have its own administration and be headed by a president or a chancellor

*University Campus* (University of California and The California State University) A separately accredited, degree-granting institution offering programs at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels, usually at a single campus location owned by the Regents or the Trustees, university campuses enroll a minimum of 1,000 full-time-equivalent students. A university campus will have its own administration and be headed by a president or chancellor

*Institution* (all three systems): As used in these guidelines, "institution" refers to an educational center, a college, or a university campus, but not to an outreach operation

**Projects subject to Commission review**

New institutions (educational centers, campuses, and colleges) are subject to review, while outreach operations are not The Commission may, however, review and comment on other projects consistent with its overall State planning and coordination role

**Stages in the review process**

Three stages of systemwide responsibility are involved in the process by which the Commission reviews proposals for new institutions. (1) the formulation of a long-range plan by each of the three public systems; (2) the submission of a "Letter of Intent to Expand" by the systemwide governing board, and (3) the submission of a "Needs Study" by the systemwide governing board Each of these stages is discussed below

1 *The systemwide long-range plan*

Plans for new institutions should be made by the

Regents, the Trustees, and the Board of Governors only after the adoption of a systemwide plan that addresses total statewide long-range growth needs, including the capacity of existing institutions to accommodate those needs. Each governing board should submit its statewide plan to the Commission for review and comment (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) before proceeding with plans for the acquisition or construction of new institutions. Each system must update its systemwide long-range plan every five years and submit it to the Commission for review and comment.

Each systemwide long-range plan should include the following elements:

- For all three public systems, a 15-year undergraduate enrollment projection for the system, presented in terms of both headcount and full-time-equivalent students (FTES). Such projections shall include a full explanation of all assumptions underlying them, consider the annual projections developed by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance, and explain any significant departures from those projections.
- For the University of California and the California State University, a systemwide 15-year graduate enrollment projection, presented with a full explanation of all assumptions underlying the projection.
- Each of the three public systems should provide evidence within the long-range plan of cooperative planning with California's other public systems, such as documentation of official contacts, meetings, correspondence, or other efforts to integrate its own planning with the planning efforts of the other public systems and with any independent colleges and universities in the area. The physical capacities of existing independent colleges and universities should be considered. If disagreements exist among the systems regarding such matters as enrollment projections or the scope, location, construction, or conversion of new facilities, the long-range plan should clearly state the nature of those disagreements.
- For all three public systems, the physical and planned enrollment capacity of each institution within the system. Physical capacity shall be determined by analyzing existing capacity space plus funded capacity projects. Planned enrollment capacity shall be the ultimate enrollment capacity of the institution as determined by the respective governing board of the system -- Regents, Trustees, or Board of Governors.
- For all three public systems, a development plan that includes the approximate opening dates (within a range of plus or minus two years) of all new institutions -- educational centers, community colleges, and university campuses, the approximate capacity of those institutions at opening and after five and ten years of operation, the geographic area in which each institution is to be located (region of the State for the University of California, county or city for the California State University, and district for community colleges), and whether a center is proposed to be converted into a community college or university campus within the 15-year period specified.
- A projection of the capital outlay cost (excluding bond interest) of any new institutions proposed to be built within the 15-year period specified, arrayed by capacity at various stages over the fifteen-year period (e.g. opening enrollment of 2,000 FTES; 5,000 FTES five years later, etc.), together with a statement of the assumptions used to develop the cost projection.
- A projection of the ongoing capital outlay cost (excluding bond interest) of existing institutions, arrayed by the cost of new space to accommodate enrollment growth, and the cost to renovate existing buildings and infrastructure, together with a statement of the assumptions used to develop the cost projection, and with maintenance costs included only if the type of maintenance involved is normally part of a system's capital outlay budget.

2 *The "Letter of Intent to Expand"*

*New university campuses.* No less than five years prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Regents or the Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a "Letter of Intent to Expand." This letter should contain the following information:

- A preliminary ten-year enrollment projection for the new university campus (from the campus's opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.
- The geographic location of the new university campus (region of the State for the University of California and county or city for the California State University)
- If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution, the reason for prioritizing the proposed university campus ahead of other new institutions should be specified
- A time schedule for development of the new university campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages
- A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.
- A copy of the resolution by the governing board authorizing the new university campus
- Maps of the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations

*Conversion by the University of California or the California State University of an existing educational center to a university campus* No less than three years prior to the time it expects to enroll lower division students for the first time, the Regents or the Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a "Letter of Intent to Expand." This letter should contain the following information.

- The complete enrollment history (headcount and full-time-equivalent students) or the previous ten years history (whichever is less) of the educational center. A preliminary ten-year enrollment projection for the new university campus (from the campus's opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance. The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage
- If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of other new institution(s), the reason for prioritizing the proposed university campus ahead of other new institutions should be specified
- A time schedule for converting the educational center and for developing the new university campus, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages
- A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation for the new university campus
- A copy of the resolution by the governing board authorizing conversion of the educational center to a university campus.
- Maps of the area in which the proposed university campus is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

*New educational centers of the University of California and the California State University* No less than two years prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Regents or the Trustees should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a "Letter of Intent to Expand." This letter should contain the following information

- A preliminary five-year enrollment projection for the new educational center (from the center's opening date), developed by the systemwide central office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance The systemwide central office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage.

- The location of the new educational center in terms as specific as possible An area not exceeding a few square miles in size should be identified.
- If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution, the reasons for prioritizing the proposed educational center ahead of other new institutions should be specified.
- A time schedule for development of the new educational center, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.
- A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation
- A copy of the resolution by the governing board authorizing the new educational center.
- Maps of the area in which the proposed educational center is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

*New California Community Colleges* No less than 36 months prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a "Letter of Intent to Expand." This letter should contain the following information

- A preliminary ten-year enrollment projection for the new college (from the college's opening date), developed by the district and/or the Chancellor's Office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance The Chancellor's Office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage
- The location of the new college in terms as specific as possible, usually not exceeding a few square miles
- A copy of the district's most recent five-year capital construction plan
- If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution within the 15-year term of the plan, the plan should prioritize the proposed new colleges in terms of three five-year intervals (near term, mid term, and long term) Priorities within each of the five-year periods of time shall be established through the Board of Governors five-year capital outlay planning process required by Supplemental Language to the 1989 Budget Act.
- A time schedule for development of the new college, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages
- A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation
- A copy of the resolution by the Board of Governors authorizing the new college
- Maps of the area in which the proposed new college is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations.

*New California Community College educational centers* No less than 18 months prior to the time it expects its first capital outlay appropriation, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges should submit to the Commission (with copies to the Department of Finance, the Demographic Research Unit, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) a "Letter of Intent to Expand " This letter should contain the following information

- A preliminary five-year enrollment projection for the new educational center (from the center's opening date), developed by the district and/or the Chancellor's Office, which should be consistent with the statewide projections developed annually by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance The Chancellor's Office may seek the advice of the Unit in developing the projection, but Unit approval is not required at this stage
- The location of the new educational center in terms as specific as possible, usually not exceeding a few square miles

- A copy of the district's most recent five-year capital construction plan
- If the statewide plan envisions the construction or acquisition of more than one new institution within the 15-year term of the plan, the plan should prioritize the proposed new centers in terms of three five-year intervals (near term, mid term, and long term). Priorities within each of the five-year periods of time shall be established through the Board of Governors five-year capital outlay planning process required by Supplemental Language to the 1989 Budget Act
- A time schedule for development of the new educational center, including preliminary dates and enrollment levels at the opening, final buildout, and intermediate stages.
- A tentative ten-year capital outlay budget starting on the date of the first capital outlay appropriation.
- A copy of the resolution by the Board of Governors authorizing the new educational center
- Maps of the area in which the proposed educational center is to be located, indicating population densities, topography, and road and highway configurations

3 *Commission response to the "Letter of Intent to Expand"*

Once the "Letter of Intent to Expand" is received, Commission staff will review the enrollment projections and other data and information that serve as the basis for the proposed new institution If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission's executive director will advise the systemwide chief executive officer to move forward with site acquisition or further development plans The Executive Director may in this process raise concerns about defects in the Letter of Intent to Expand that need to be addressed in the planning process If the Executive Director is unable to advise the chief executive officer to move forward with the expansion plan, he or she shall so state to the chief executive officer prior to notifying the Department of Finance and the Legislature of the basis for the negative recommendation. The Executive Director shall respond to the chief executive officer, in writing, no later than 60 days following submission of the Letter of Intent to Expand to the Commission.

4 *Development of the "needs study"*

Following the Executive Director's preliminary recommendation to move forward, the systemwide central offices shall proceed with the final process of identifying potential sites for the new institution. If property for the new institution is already owned by the system, alternative sites must be identified and considered in the manner required by the California Environmental Quality Act So as to avoid redundancy in the preparation of information, all materials germane to the environmental impact report process shall be made available to the Commission at the same time that they are made available to the designated responsible agencies

Upon approval of the environmental impact report by the lead agency, the systemwide central office shall forward the final environmental impact report for the site as well as the final needs study for the new institution to the Commission The needs study must respond fully to each of the criteria outlined below, which collectively will constitute the basis on which the proposal for the new institution will be evaluated. The needs study shall be complete only upon receipt of the environmental impact report, the academic master plan, the special enrollment projection approved by the Demographic Research Unit, and complete responses to each of the criteria listed below

5 *Commission action*

Once the Commission has received the completed needs study, the Executive Director shall certify the completeness of that Needs Study to the systemwide chief executive officer The Commission shall take final action on any proposal for a new institution according to the following schedule

New university campus
- University of California One Year
- The California State University One Year

New college
- California Community Colleges Six Months

New Educational Center
- University of California Six Months
- The California State University Six Months

California Community Colleges · Four Months

Once the Commission has taken action on the proposal, the Executive Director will notify the appropriate legislative committee chairs, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst

**Criteria for evaluating proposals**

As stated in Sections 66903[2a] and 66903[5] of the Education Code, the Commission's responsibility is to determine "the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public higher education." The criteria below follow that categorization:

*Criteria related to need*

1 *Enrollment projections*

1 1 Enrollment projections must be sufficient to justify the establishment of the "new institution," as that term is defined above For a proposed new educational center, enrollment projections for each of the first five years of operation (from the center's opening date), must be provided For a proposed new college or university campus, enrollment projections for each of the first ten years of operation (from the college's or campus's opening date) must be provided. When an existing educational center is proposed to be converted to a new college or university campus, the center's previous enrollment history, or the previous ten year's history (whichever is less) must also be provided.

As the designated demographic agency for the State, the Demographic Research Unit has the statutory responsibility for preparing systemwide and district enrollment. For a proposed new institution, the Unit will approve all projections of undergraduate enrollment developed by a systemwide central office of one of the public systems or by the community college district proposing the new institution The Unit shall provide the systems with advice and instructions on the preparation of enrollment projections Community College projections shall be developed pursuant to the Unit's instructions, included as Appendix B of these guidelines on pages 17-34

Undergraduate enrollment projections for new institutions of the University of California and the California State University shall be presented in terms of headcount and full-time-equivalent students (FTES). Lower-division enrollment projections for new institutions of the California Community Colleges shall be presented in terms of headcount students, Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH), and WSCH per headcount student.

Graduate and professional student enrollment projections shall be prepared by the systemwide central office proposing the new institution In preparing these projections, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the projections, an analysis of supply and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees, must be provided

1 2 For a new University of California campus, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Regents pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling statewide needs for the establishment of the new university campus must be demonstrated In order for compelling statewide needs to be established, the University must demonstrate why these needs deserve priority attention over competing systemwide needs for both support and capital outlay funding

1 3 For a new University of California educational center, statewide enrollment projected for the University should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Regents pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the University system, compelling statewide needs for the establishment of the new educational center must be demonstrated In order for compelling statewide needs to be established, the University must demonstrate why these needs deserve priority attention over competing needs in other sectors of the University for both support and capital outlay funding

1 4 For a new California State University campus, statewide enrollment projected for the State

University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Board of Trustees pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated In order for compelling regional needs to be demonstrated, the system must specify why these regional needs deserve priority attention over competing needs in other sectors of the State University system for both support and capital outlay funding

1 5 For a new California State University educational center, statewide enrollment projected for the State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses and educational centers as defined in the systemwide long-range plan developed by the Board of Trustees pursuant to Item 1 of these guidelines. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the State University system, compelling statewide or regional needs for the establishment of the new educational center must be demonstrated In order for compelling statewide or regional needs to be established, the State University must demonstrate why these needs deserve priority attention over competing needs in other sectors of the University for both support and capital outlay funding

1 6 For a new community college or educational center, enrollment projected for the district proposing the college or educational center should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges and educational centers If the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district colleges or educational centers, compelling regional or local needs must be demonstrated The district shall demonstrate local needs by satisfying the requirements of the criteria specified in these guidelines Regional and statewide needs shall be demonstrated by the Board of Governors through the long-range planning process

2 *Programmatic alternatives*

2 1 Proposals for new institutions should address at least the following alternatives (1) the possibility of establishing an educational center instead of a university campus or community college, (2) the expansion of existing institutions; (3) the increased utilization of existing institutions, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, and during the summer months, (4) the shared use of existing or new facilities and programs with other postsecondary education institutions, in the same or other public systems or independent institutions, (5) the use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery, such as "colleges without walls" and distance learning through interactive television and computerized instruction, and (6) private fund raising or donations of land or facilities for the proposed new institution

3 *Serving the disadvantaged*

3 1 The new institution must facilitate access for disadvantaged and historically underrepresented groups

4 *Academic planning and program justification*

4.1 The programs projected for the new institution must be described and justified. An academic master plan, including a general sequence of program and degree level plans, and an institutional plan to implement such State goals as access, quality; intersegmental cooperation, and diversification of students, faculty, administration, and staff for the new institution, must be provided

5 *Consideration of needed funding*

5 1 A cost analysis of both capital outlay estimates and projected support costs for the new institution, and possible options for alternative funding sources, must be provided

*Criteria related to location*

6 *Consideration of alternative sites*

6 1 A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including a consideration of alternative sites for the new institution, must be articulated and documented This criterion may be satisfied by the Environmental Impact Report, provided it contains a comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative sites

7. *Geographic and physical accessibility*

7 1 The physical, social, and demographic characteristics of the location and surrounding service areas for the new institution must be included

7 2 There must be a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed location Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities, should be included if appropriate For locations that do not plan to maintain student on-campus residences, reasonable commuting time for students -- defined generally as not exceeding a 30-45 minute automobile drive (including time to locate parking) for a majority of the residents of the service area -- must be demonstrated

8 *Environmental and social impact*

8.1 The proposal must include a copy of the final environmental impact report. To expedite the review process, the Commission should be provided all information related to the environmental impact report process as it becomes available to responsible agencies and the public

9. *Effects on other institutions*

9.1 Other systems, institutions, and the community in which the new institution is to be located should be consulted during the planning process, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated by letters of support from responsible agencies, groups, and individuals

9 2 The establishment of a new University of California or California State University campus or educational center must take into consideration the impact of a new facility on existing and projected enrollments in the neighboring institutions of its own and of other systems

9 3 The establishment of a new community college must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges -- either within the district proposing the new college or in adjacent districts -- to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs

*Other considerations*

10 *Economic efficiency*

10 1 Since it is in the best interests of the State to encourage maximum economy of operation, priority shall be given to proposals for new institutions where the State of California is relieved of all or part of the financial burden When such proposals include gifts of land, construction costs, or equipment, a higher priority shall be granted to such projects than to projects where all costs are born by the State, assuming all other criteria listed above are satisfied.

10 2 A higher priority shall be given to projects involving intersegmental cooperation, provided the systems or institutions involved can demonstrate a financial savings or programmatic advantage to the State as a result of the cooperative effort.

# Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers (1990 Edition)

## Introduction

*Commission responsibilities and authority regarding new campuses and centers*

California *Education Code* Section 66904 expresses the intent of the Legislature that the sites for new institutions or branches of public postsecondary education will not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission.

> It is the intent of the Legislature that sites for new institutions or branches of the University of California and the California State University, and the classes of off-campus centers as the commission shall determine, shall not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the commission
>
> It is further the of the Legislature that California community colleges shall not receive state funds for acquisition of sites or construction of new institutions, branches or off-campus centers unless recommended by the commission Acquisition or construction of non-state-funded community colleges, branches and off- campus centers, and proposals for acquisition or construction shall be reported to and may be reviewed and commented upon by the Commission

*Evolution and purpose of the guidelines*

In order to carry out its given responsibilities in this area, the Commission in April 1975 adopted policies relating to the review of new campuses and centers and revised those policies in September 1978 and September 1982 Both the 1975 document and the two revisions outlined the Commission's basic assumptions under which the guidelines and procedures were developed and then specified the proposals subject to Commission review, the criteria for reviewing proposals, the schedule to be followed by the segments when submitting proposals, and the contents of the required "needs studies "

*Reasons for the current revisions*

By 1988, experience with the existing procedures suggested that they needed revision in order to accommodate the changed planning environment in California, particularly related to California's Environmental Quality Act and the environmental impact report (EIR) process, as well as to accommodate various provisions of the recently renewed Master Plan for Higher Education In addition, California's postsecondary enrollment demand continues to increase, and as the public segments move forward with their long-range facilities plans, the time is particularly ripe for revising the existing guidelines. This revision is intended to (1) ensure that the public segments grow in an orderly and efficient manner and that they meet the State's policy objectives for postsecondary education under the Master Plan, (2) ensure proper and timely review by the State of segmental plans based on clearly stated criteria, and (3) assist the segments in determining the procedures that need to be followed to prepare and implement their expansion plans

## Policy assumptions used in developing these guidelines

The following six policy assumptions are central to the development of the procedures and criteria that the Commission uses in reviewing proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers.

1 It will continue to be State policy that each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education will have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education The California Community Colleges shall continue to be accessible to all persons at least 18 years of age who can benefit from the instruction offered, regardless of district boundaries The California State University and the University of California shall continue to be accessible to first-time freshmen among the pool

of students eligible according to Master Plan eligibility guidelines Master Plan guidelines on undergraduate admission priorities will continue to be (1) continuing undergraduates in good standing, (2) California residents who are successful transfers from California public community colleges, (3) California residents entering at the freshman or sophomore level, and (4) residents of other states or foreign countries

2 The differentiation of function between the segments with regard to institutional mission shall continue to be as defined by the State's Master Plan for Higher Education

3. The University of California plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide need

4 The California State University plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide needs and special regional considerations

5 The California Community Colleges plan and develop their campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of local needs

6 Planned enrollment capacities are established for and observed by all campuses of public postsecondary education These capacities are determined on the basis of statewide and institutional economies, community and campus environment, limitations on campus size, program requirements and student enrollment levels, and internal organization. Planned capacities are established by the governing boards of community college districts (and reviewed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges), the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of California These capacities, as well as the statewide procedures for setting these capacities, are subject to review and recommendation by the Commission provided in California *Education Code* Section 66903

**Projects subject to Commission review**

The following types of projects are subject to review new campuses and permanent off-campus centers, major off-campus centers in leased facilities, and conversion of off-campus centers to full-service campuses The Commission may also review and comment on other projects consistent with its overall State planning and coordination role

**Schedule for the review of new projects**

The following timelines are meant to allow a reasonable amount of time for Commission review of plans at appropriate stages in the process The Commission can accelerate its review of the process if it so chooses

Unless otherwise specified, all three public postsecondary segments should endeavor to observe these timelines when proposing construction of a major new project subject to Commission review under these guidelines

1 Plans for new campuses and permanent off-campus centers should be made by the segmental governing boards following their adoption of a systemwide planning framework designed to address total statewide segmental long-range growth needs, including the capacity of existing campuses and centers to accommodate those needs, and the development of new campuses and centers This planning framework should be submitted to the Commission for review and comment before proceeding with plans for location and construction of new campuses

2 Segments are requested to defer the selection of specific sites for new campuses or permanent off-campus centers until such time as they have informed the Commission of their general plans for expansion and received a recommendation from the Commission to proceed with further expansion activity. No later than one year prior to the date the segment expects to forward a final proposal for a new campus or center to the Commission, or 18 months prior to the time when it hopes

the Commission will forward its final recommendation about the facility to the Governor and Legislature, it is requested to transmit a letter of intent to expand to the Commission The letter of intent should include, at minimum, the following information for the new campus (1) preliminary projections of enrollment demand by age of student and level of instruction, (2) its general location, and (3) the basis on which the segment has determined that expansion in this area at this time is a systemwide priority in contrast to other potential segmental priorities Other information that may be available that will be required at the time of the final needs study (see below, item 1-4) may also be submitted at this time

3 Once the "letter of intent" is received, Commission staff will review the enrollment projections and other data and information that serve as the basis for the proposed new campus This review will be done in consultation with staff from the Demographic Research Unit in the State Department of Finance, which is the agency statutorily responsible for demographic research and population projections. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission will recommend that the segments move forward with their site acquisition or further development plans The Commission may in this process raise concerns with the segments about defects in the plans that need to be addressed in the planning process If the Commission is unable to recommend approval of moving forward with the expansion plans, it shall so state to the segmental governing board prior to notifying the Department of Finance and the Legislature of its analysis and the basis for its negative recommendation The Commission shall consider the preliminary plan no later than 60 days following its submission to the Commission

4 Following the Commission's preliminary recommendation to move forward, the segments are requested to proceed with the final process of identifying potential sites for the campus or permanent off-campus center. If property appropriate for the campus or center is already owned by the segment, alternative sites to that must be identified and considered in the manner required by the California Environmental Quality Act So as to avoid redundancy in preparation of information, all materials that are germane to the environmental impact report process shall be made available to the Commission at the same time that it is made available to the designated responsible agencies

5 Upon completion of the environmental review process and no more than six months prior to the time of expected final Commission approval of the proposed new campus, the segment shall forward the final environmental impact report for the site as well as the final needs study report for the campus or center to the Commission The needs study report should address each of the criteria outlined below on which the proposal for the campus or center will be evaluated

6 Once the Commission has received from the segment all materials necessary for evaluating the proposal, it shall certify the completeness of the application to the segment. The Commission shall take final action on proposals during the next six months. In reviewing the proposal, the Commission will seek approval of the enrollment projections by the Demographic Research Unit, unless the justification for expansion is primarily unrelated to meeting access demands Once the Commission has taken action on the proposal, it will so notify both the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

## Criteria for evaluating proposals

1 *Enrollment projections*

1.1 For new facilities that are planned to accommodate expanded enrollments, enrollment projections should be sufficient to justify the establishment of the campus or off-campus center For the proposed new campus or center, enrollment projections for each of the first ten years of operation, and for the fifteenth and twentieth years, must be provided When an existing off-campus center is proposed to be converted to a new campus, all previous enrollment experience must also be provided

As the designated demographic agency for the State, the Demographic Research Unit has lead responsibility for preparing systemwide and district enrollment projections, as well as projections for specific

proposals The Demographic Research Unit will prepare enrollment projections for all Community College proposals, and either the Demographic Research Unit population projections or K-12 enrollment estimates must be used as the basis for generating enrollment projections in any needs study prepared by the University of California or the California State University For the two University segments, the Commission will request the Demographic Research Unit to review and approve demographically-driven enrollment projections prior to Commission consideration of the final proposal, unless the campus or permanent center is justified on academic, policy, or other criteria that do not relate strictly to enrollment demand.

For graduate/professional student enrollment estimates, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the estimates, an analysis of supply of and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees, must be provided

1.2 Statewide enrollment projected for the University of California should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses as defined in their long-range development plans If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling statewide needs for the establishment of the new campus must be demonstrated

1 3 Statewide enrollment projected for the California State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses as defined by their enrollment ceilings If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated. In order for compelling regional needs to be demonstrated, the segment must specify how these regional needs deserve priority attention over competing segmental priorities

1 4 Enrollment projected for a community college district should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district campuses If the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district campuses, compelling regional or local needs must be demonstrated. In order for compelling regional needs to be demonstrated, the segment must specify how these regional needs deserve priority attention over others in the State.

1 5 Enrollments projected for community college campuses must be within a reasonable commuting time of the campus, and should exceed the minimum size for a community college district established by legislation (1,000 units of average daily attendance [ADA] two years after opening)

2. *Alternatives to new campuses or off-campus centers*

2 1 Proposals for a new campus or off-campus center should address alternatives to establishment of new institutions, including (1) the possibility of establishing an off-campus center instead of a campus; (2) the expansion of existing campuses, (3) the increased utilization of existing campuses, such as year-round operation, (4) the increased use of existing facilities and programs in other postsecondary education segments, and (5) the use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery, such as telecommunication and distance learning

2 2 A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including alternative sites for the campus or center must be articulated and documented.

3. *Serving the disadvantaged*

The campus or center must facilitate access for the economically, educationally, socially, and physically disadvantaged

4. *Geographic and physical accessibility*

The physical, social, and demographic characteristics of the location and surrounding service areas for the new campus or center must be included There must be a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed location Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities, should be included as appropriate For locations which do not plan to maintain student on-campus residences, reasonable commuting time for students must be demonstrated

5 *Environmental and social impact*

The proposal must include a copy of the environmental impact report. To expedite the review process, the Commission should be provided all information related to the environmental impact report process as it becomes available to responsible agencies and the public

6 *Effects on other institutions*

6.1 Other segments, institutions, and the community in which the campus or center is to be located should be consulted during the planning process for the new facility, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated.

6 2 The establishment of a new University of California or California State University campus or center must take into consideration the impact of a new facility on existing and projected enrollments in the neighboring institutions of its own and of other segments

6 3 The establishment of a new community college campus must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges -- either within the district proposing the new campus or in adjacent districts -- to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs

7 *Academic planning and program justification*

The programs projected for the new campus must be described and justified An academic master plan, including general sequence of program plans and degree level plans, and a campus plan to implement such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, diversification of students, faculty, administration and staff for the new campus, must be provided The proposal must include plans to provide an equitable learning environment for the recruitment, retention and success of historically underrepresented students.

8 *Consideration of needed funding*

A cost analysis of both capital outlay estimates and projected support costs for the new campus or permanent off-campus center, and possible options of alternative funding sources, must be provided

## GUIDE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

## PROJECTION OF ENROLLMENT AND ANNUAL AVERAGE WEEKLY STUDENT CONTACT HOURS FOR NEW COLLEGES AND EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

Under California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) guidelines community college districts must provide enrollment projections for new colleges and educational centers. If state funding is required for a new institution the enrollment projections must be approved by the Demographic Research Unit (DRU), Department of Finance (DOF)

Districts may submit enrollment projections between September and January Review will take place between October and February with a minimum of four weeks for review. If more enrollment projections are submitted than can be reviewed by DRU staff in the time available, projections will be prioritized by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Facilities Planning Unit for DRU review

DRU staff are available on a limited basis to meet with districts during the development of a projection on issues such as data, projection methodology, and assumptions to assure conformity with the guidelines

A projection for a new institution must include the following data with all assumptions articulated and supported by documentation before DOF will approve the projection

Demographic Research Unit
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-3701
(916) 322-4651

## DATA

1. Site description

2. Opening date and description of the proposed curriculum as it is expected to develop over the projection period

   This section must also address associated changes that can be expected in the ratios of full-time to part-time students, credit to noncredit students, day to evening students, and older to younger students. Also include a discussion of the impact of the proposed development on the programs currently in place in the district and on all neighboring colleges

3 Population projections

   Population projections from the local council of governments or county planning agency for (a) the county, (b) the district, and (c) the service area of the new institution, or for the geographic areas that best approximate those boundaries (for example, ZIP codes or census tracts) must be provided.

   The district must document the source of the projections, including the date of their release and the levels of detail for which they are available (geographic detail, time intervals, and age/gender detail)

   State Administrative Manual Sections 1101 and 1103 require that the population forecasts used in planning not exceed Department of Finance projections on a regional basis If the population projections used by the district exceed the Department of Finance projections, they must be made consistent.

   Although not required, it is recommended that the projections be controlled upward to the most recent Department of Finance population projections at the county level, if local population forecasts are below DOF

   If the local planning agencies and the local council of governments have no subcounty-level population projections, a letter from those agencies confirming that fact is required. In that case, the most recent Department of Finance county population projections may be used in combination with 1990 Census data by census tract to determine the proportion of the county population within the service area and within the district.

   Population age 18 through 64 is to be used as the base for calculating participation rates and for projecting community college enrollment. It may be preferable to use greater detail by gender, ethnicity, and age (ages groups 18-24, 25-34, 35-64), if the population of the service area differs in composition from the remainder of the district's population

4. Service area and maps

The district must identify the primary service area of the new institution and provide a map showing the district and the service area borders in terms of the geographic boundaries used in the population projections (e.g., if the population projections are available by ZIP code, the district must define the service area in terms of ZIP codes and provide a ZIP code map of the district).

The service area must be justified by documented attendance patterns evident in the district's enrollment data and within a reasonable commute time. Population outside of the district's boundaries may be used in a projection only with the written approval of both the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and CPEC

A map illustrating roads and commute patterns in the area expected to generate students for the new institution must also be included

5. Enrollment data

The district must provide unduplicated fall first-census enrollment for the most recent year consistent with its official fall first-census data reported by the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office cross-tabulated

a) by residence of student by ZIP code, census tract, or other unit of geography consistent with the geographic divisions for which population projections are available, and

b) by location of attendance

A format example is attached (Form 1).

Note. All students, regardless of residence are included

6. Historical data

The projection must provide a history of enrollment and annual average weekly student contact hours for day credit, evening credit, and noncredit categories for all current programs which will be absorbed by the new institution. Ten years of historical data are required for recognized educational centers; three years of historical data are required for outreach operations For example, if an entire outreach operation (site 1) and one small program from a college (site 2) are to be moved to a proposed educational center, historical data (not projected data) must be provided for each site as well as for the remainder of the district. Sample worksheets are attached (Forms 2 and 3)

It is critical for approval of the projections that the enrollment and annual average WSCH used in the projection be consistent with the district's official numbers reported by the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office An explanation of the method of calculating annual average weekly student hours (WSCH) follows.

7 Projection

Projections must meet the requirements of both the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and CPEC. A recommended format is attached (Form 4).

CPEC's guidelines require the following:

> For a proposed new education center, enrollment projections for each of the first five years of operation (from the center's opening date), must be provided. For a proposed new college or university campus, enrollment projections for each of the first ten years of operation (from the college's or campus's opening date) must be provided When an existing educational center is proposed to be converted to a new college or university campus, the center's previous enrollment history, or the previous ten year's history (whichever is less) must also be provided

8 Copy of "Letter of Intent to Expand" with attachments

Form 1

## ENROLLMENT DATA

Use Fall first-census UNDUPLICATED total enrollment by ZIP code by site (institution or outreach operation). Each site that will be moved to the new institution should be listed as well as the remainder of the district. Data for several small outreach operations in the service area may be grouped as one site if they are all similar and will be moved to the new institution. Grouped data must have a footnote listing the sites.

STUDENTS ATTENDING MORE THAN ONE INSTITUTION SHOULD BE COUNTED IN ONLY ONE INSTITUTION. If a significant number of students attend more than one institution, please note their total number, where they were counted, and which other institution they attend.

Facility

| | Site 1 + | Site 2 + | Remainder/Dist = | Total District* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (Include students enrolled in BOTH day and evening) | | | |
| **Total Enrollment** | | | | |
| ZIPS 9____ | _____ | | _____ | |
| 9____ | _____ | | _____ | |
| 9____ | _____ | | _____ | |
| 9____ | _____ | | _____ | |
| 9____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | |
| 9____ | _____ | | _____ | |
| 9____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | |
| Center Subtotal | _____ | _____ | _____ | |
| All other ZIPS | | _____ | _____ | |
| Sum of ZIPS | _____ | _____ | _____ | |

* District enrollment should match district enrollment reported on the Department of Finance report, " Projection of Fall Enrollment and Annual Average WSCH." Districts with more sites will need more data columns.

Form 2

## HISTORICAL ENROLLMENT DATA

Fall first-census UNDUPLICATED enrollment should be listed for each institution or outreach operation site that will be moved to the new institution, and for the remainder of the district. Data for several small outreach operations in the service area may be grouped consistent with Form 1.

Facility*

| Category and Years | Site 1 | + | Site 2 | + | Remainder/Dist. | = | Total District* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Eve Credit | | | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | | | |
| Day Credit | | | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | | | |
| Noncredit | | | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | | | |

* Columns should add to "Total District." "Total District" should match the Department of Finance report, "Projection of Fall Enrollment and Annual Average WSCH" for day credit, evening credit and noncredit categories. Districts with more sites will need more data columns.

## HISTORICAL WSCH DATA

(Please see attached instruction sheet for calculation of WSCH)

Annual average WSCH should be listed for each institution or outreach operation site that will be moved to the new institution, and for the remainder of the district. Data for several small outreach operations in the service area may be grouped consistent with Form 1.

Facility:

| Category and Years | Site 1 | + | Site 2 | + | Remainder/Dist. | = | Total District* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Eve Credit | | | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | | | |
| Day Credit | | | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | | | |
| Noncredit | | | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | | | | | | | |
| 1989-90 | | | | | | | |
| 1990-91 | | | | | | | |

* Columns should add to "Total District." "Total District" should match the Department of Finance report, "Projection of Fall Enrollment and Annual Average WSCH" for day credit, evening credit and noncredit categories. Districts with more sites will need more data columns.

## COMPUTATION OF ANNUAL AVERAGE WSCH FROM STUDENT CONTACT HOURS REPORT

The "Community Colleges Student Contact Hours" for the fiscal year, P-3, is prepared by the Chancellor's Office in August each year. This report contains Summer, Fall, Winter, and Spring WSCH data.

For all schools: Calculate the number of weeks in the academic year by dividing the number of term days by five

Day credit. Add total hours for day daily census procedure courses and actual hours of attendance procedure courses Divide that total by the number of weeks in the academic year and add it to the day mean of all weekly census procedure courses (first census WSCH for each term, divided by the number of terms)

Evening credit: Repeat the same procedure for extended day.

Noncredit Noncredit is reported under actual hours of attendance procedure courses, noncredit courses Divide the total noncredit hours by the number of weeks in the academic year

Keep in mind that

Summer intersession courses are never included in the calculations.

Computations are done at the campus level, then summed to the district level

Computations for day credit and evening credit include work experience and independent study

Student contact hours are the sum of hours for resident and nonresident students

Demographic Research Unit
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-3701

## EXAMPLE OF PROJECTION FOR A NEW EDUCATIONAL CENTER

| Year of Fall Term | DAY CREDIT | | | EVENING CREDIT | | | NON-CREDIT | | | TOTAL | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Enrollment | WSCH | WSCH/ Enr. | Enrollment | WSCH | WSCH/ Enr. | Enrollment | WSCH | WSCH/ Enr | Enrollment | WSCH | WSCH/ Enr, |
| Historical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1988 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1989 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Projected | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1992 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1993 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1995 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New educational center scheduled to open Fall 1996 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1996 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1997 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1999 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Form 4

Appendix B

## METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS

The following is a suggested method of developing enrollment projections for new institutions. Other methods may also be acceptable provided that they are (a) adequately documented with the requested data, (b) based upon official population projections, and (c) based upon reasonable, justified assumptions. If a method other than the suggested method is chosen, the district should discuss the method with DRU staff.

1. Match the student data with the population data. If the geography of the population data is not the same as the student data geography, then the two units of geography must be assigned as whole units or proportions of units to the proposed service area and to the remainder of the district. Maps and enrollment data provided by the district must clearly illustrate and support the assignment.

2. Calculate historical participation rates using enrollment data (from Data, step 5) and population (age 18 - 64 if possible). A participation rate is enrollment divided by population multiplied by 1000. Three sets of rates are needed:

   a) rates for the aggregated sites which will be incorporated by the new institution - divide total enrollment from those sites by the population of the proposed service area

   b) rates for the proposed service area - divide the total of all district students who reside within the service area boundaries by the population of the service area and

   c) rates for the remainder of the district - divide all district students minus the number of students residing in the service area (students in 2 b) by the population of the remainder of the district (district population less proposed service area population)

   Generally if the new institution will provide a credit program only, only credit enrollment is used in all the calculations.

3. To derive total enrollment for the years between the current year and the first year the new institution will be open, multiply the participation rate calculated in step 2.a by the projected service area population for each year This method assumes no significant changes in participation rate between the last year for which enrollment data are available and the opening of the new institution This assumption may require variation based upon circumstances in the district (available space and resources, for example).

4. An assumption must be made at this point regarding the participation rate that will be reached in the service area after the new institution is open. Depending upon

how closely the new institution's curriculum resembles the course offerings available at other institutions in the district, and how closely the service area resembles the rest of the district, assume that the participation rate will reach 75% to 100% of the remainder of district participation rates. The participation rate for residents of the service area should not exceed the participation rate for the remainder of the district.

5. To project total enrollment for the new institution, calculate the difference between the participation rate for the proposed service area and the participation rate for the remainder of the district adjusted in step 4 ((2.c * x%) - 2 b) Add this figure to the participation rate for the outreach and existing institutions which will be moved to the new institution (step 2.a). The result will be the participation rate for the new institution, once it is established. Normally this new participation rate is phased in over the first three years of operation Total enrollment is the result of multiplying the projected population by the participation rate.

   Note. Some students included in the calculation of step 2.b may attend classes elsewhere in the district Generally, it is assumed that the participation of these students at other district facilities will remain constant throughout the projection, but this assumption may be adjusted depending upon the district's overall capacity and projected growth. For example, if the district's existing institutions can absorb more service area students, it may be appropriate to assume that they will serve a greater proportion If, however, the district's institutions are already impacted and population growth in the remainder of the district will exceed the capacity of the district's existing facilities, then it may be appropriate to assume that a smaller proportion will be served by existing facilities once the new institution is opened

6 The proportions of students in day credit, evening credit, and noncredit categories are to be based on the history of the programs being absorbed by the new institution, in line with the program description for the new institution, and applied to the projected enrollment total. Generally the proportions will not change until the new institution opens

7 Project the annual average WSCH to enrollment ratios for each category, day credit, evening credit, and noncredit, reflecting the developments described in the curriculum explanation. Generally ratios are held constant until the new institution opens, then gradually increased to more closely resemble the district's ratios. The ratios for a center are normally lower than they are for a fully developed college.

8. Calculate annual average WSCH for the projection period by multiplying enrollments by the ratios developed in the previous step. This process must be repeated for day credit, evening credit, and noncredit, then summed to the total.

# *References*


California Postsecondary Education Commission *The Commission's Role in the Review of Proposals for New Campuses and Off-Campus Centers -- Guidelines and Procedures.* Unnumbered Commission Report Sacramento: The Commission, 1975.

-- *Guidelines and Procedures for Review of New Campuses and Off-Campus Centers* Commission Report 82-34 Sacramento: the Commission, September 1982

-- *Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers A Revision of the Commission's 1982 Guidelines and Procedures for Review of New Campuses and Off-Campus Centers* Commission Report 90-9 Sacramento The Commission, January 1990

**U.S. Department of Education**
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)*
*National Library of Education (NLE)*
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*

# NOTICE

## Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").